

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 4, 38, and 39 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-11, and 14-48 are pending.

Claims 1, 4-11, 14-37, 47, and 48

On page 3, the Office Action indicates that claims 1, 4-11, 14-37, 47, and 48 are in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claims 38-46 Under 35 U.S.C. §112(2)

The Office Action rejects claims 38-46 under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) for being indefinite because “the supporting case” in claims 38 and 39 lack antecedent support. Applicants amend claims 38 and 39 to change “case” to –member—to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 38 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,015,120 issued to Sweere et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Sweere”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,134,103 issued to Ghanma. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sweere and Ghanma, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a first cover and a second cover respectively disposed on opposite sides of the base plate and opposite sides of the extending part,” as recited in claim 38.

On page 3, third paragraph, the Office Action notes that Sweere does not disclose first and second covers. In addition, page 3, third paragraph of the Office Action asserts, “Ghanma teaches ... a first cover (82) and a second cover (84) respectively disposed on opposite sides of the base plate.” Col. 4, lines 60-61 of Ghanma discloses, “Flat panel display assembly 80 includes extendable base supports 82 and 84.”

Applicants amend claim 38 to further clarify that the first cover and second cover are disposed on opposite sides of the extending part. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Sweere nor Ghanma teaches this feature. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 38 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claims 40-46

The Office Action objects to claims 40 and 43-46 for being dependent upon rejected base claim 39. Applicants amend claim 39 to obviate the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. §112(2). Therefore, claims 40 and 43-46 do not depend upon a rejected base claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 40 and 43-46 is respectfully requested.

Claims 41 and 42 depend from amended independent claim 38. As discussed above, independent claim 38 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 41 and 42 is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1, 4-11, and 14-48 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 15, 2006

By: Paul F. Daebeler  
Paul F. Daebeler  
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501